

REMARKS

I. Introduction

With the addition of new claims 17 and 18, claims 7 to 18 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. While the rejection may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, claim 7 has been rewritten to obviate the rejection. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 7 to 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 to 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Japanese Patent No. 2002/280237 (“Masahiro”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,703,462 (“Woody”). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Masahiro and Woody does not render unpatentable claims 7 to 11.

Claim 7 relates to an ignition coil of an ignition system in an internal combustion engine, including, in relevant part, at least one electrically conductive component having, at least in some areas, an arrangement for an electrically effective evening out of its surface, *wherein the arrangement adjoins the housing by a smooth surface*. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, at page 5, lines 30 to 32 of the specification, as well as Figure 2.

The Office Action refers to Masahiro as disclosing all of the elements of claim 7. Specifically, the Office Action refers to the center core 110 and the wrap tube 111 of Masahiro as disclosing the electrically conductive component and the arrangement for an electrically effective evening out of its surface, respectively. Further, the Office Action states that reference numeral 150 of Masahiro is the housing.

As is apparent from Figs. 1 and 2a of Masahiro, the *arrangement* (i.e. wrap tube 111) of Masahiro **does not adjoin** the housing 150. According to Masahiro, the *arrangement* is surrounded by **secondary spool** 131, not housing 150. Thus, nowhere does

Masahiro disclose, or even suggest, an arrangement adjoining a housing, let alone an *arrangement that adjoins the housing by a smooth surface*.

As such, Masahiro does not disclose, or even suggest, an arrangement for an electrically effective evening out of its surface, *wherein the arrangement adjoins the housing by a smooth surface*. Woody does not cure the critical deficiencies of Masahiro. Therefore, the combination of Masahiro and Woody does not render unpatentable independent claim 7, or dependent claims 8 to 11.

Withdrawal of the present rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claim 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Masahiro, Woody and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0108931 (“Takeyama”). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Masahiro, Woody and Takeyama does not render unpatentable claim 12.

Claim 12 depends from claim 7 and therefore includes all of the features of claim 7. As more fully set forth above with respect to claim 7, the combination of Masahiro and Woody does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 7. Takeyama does not cure the critical deficiencies of the Masahiro and Woody references. Therefore, the combination of Masahiro, Woody and Takeyama does not render unpatentable claim 12, which depends from claim 7.

Withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 13 to 16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 13 to 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Masahiro. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Masahiro does not render unpatentable claims 13 to 16.

Claim 13 relates to an ignition coil of an ignition system in an internal combustion engine, including, in relevant part, the feature that the plastic covering is sprayed onto the inner core and the outer core as a coating. Nowhere, does Masahiro disclose, or even suggest, this feature.

Masahiro describes the wrap tube 111 and the resin layer 154 as tubular, sleeve-like features. The Examiner refers to page 2, paragraphs 7 to 11, and 14, and Figs. 2, 4, and 5b of Masahiro as allegedly disclosing that the plastic covering is sprayed onto the inner core and the outer core as a coating. However, nowhere in the paragraphs and figures

referred to by the Examiner, or anywhere else in Masahiro, is the plastic covering of the present claim - which is featured as a coating - disclosed. Figure 1 of Masahiro clearly shows that sheathing 111 is a separate part that is slipped over core 110, since openings or hollow spaces are formed between sheathing 111 and core 110. If sheathing 111 was a plastic covering sprayed as a coating, no openings or hollow spaces would exist. This is in contrast to the present claim which is a sheathing made of an electrically conductive material and in that it is a plastic covering sprayed as a coating. The coating of the present invention more completely conforms to the edges of the underlying inner and outer cores and has the technical effect of achieving particularly thin wall thicknesses of the sheathing, for example, approximately 0.5 mm, and can provide protection against the same problems as Masahiro, but with smaller space and manufacturing requirements, and greater flexibility for use with various geometries. Further, the coating is better suited to prevent electrical breakdown, since the contact between the coating and the core is more intimate. In addition, the present device is particularly easy to produce.

Further, the present claim has an outer and inner core, whereas Masahiro has only one single core.

Furthermore, sheathing 111 of Masahiro is designed to be much thicker and also must be produced in a separate tool and subsequently mounted on the core by slipping it over in a costly manner.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that Masahiro does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 13 for at least the same reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 7. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that Masahiro does not render unpatentable claim 13, or claims 14 to 16, which depend from claim 13.

Withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. New Claims 17 and 18

Claims 17 and 18 have been added herein. New claims 17 and 18 do not add any new matter and are fully supported by the present application, including the Specification. Claims 17 and 18 ultimately depend from claims 7 and 13, respectively, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claims 7 and 13.

VII. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Clifford A. Ulrich/

Dated: November 3, 2009

By Clifford A. Ulrich (Reg. No. 42,194) for:
Gerard A. Messina (Reg. No. 35,952)
One Broadway
KENYON & KENYON LLP
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646